

OBSERVATION REPORT #1

The information provided in the New Jersey Quality Baseline Validation Test Deck for LSOG 4 is inconsistent. Bell Atlantic has deviated from the process for issuing new releases.

Issues

The following issues have been identified by KPMG regarding the February, 2000 release of the New Jersey Quality Baseline Validation Test Deck for LSOG 4¹:

- KPMG identified seven Order scenario descriptions in the summary matrix at the beginning of the Test Deck that were inconsistent with the descriptions of the actual, associated scenario listings. *(Appendix A)*
- KPMG identified six Order and thirteen Pre-Order scenarios with errors that may lead to procedural or transactional problems when the orders are submitted. *(Appendices B, C)*
- KPMG identified five Order scenario-related issues that serve as potential obstacles to successful CTE testing. *(Appendix D)*

The New Jersey Quality Baseline Validation Test Deck is required to undergo a quality assurance test either before or at the time of the issuance of the new release. Based upon the number of errors found in the test deck, the current quality assurance process does not ensure that wholesale customers have access to a complete and accurate test environment.

The errors and inconsistencies within the test deck scenarios indicate that CTE testing procedures and policies are being carried out in a manner that is incompatible with CLEC business needs. For example, Quality Baseline Validation Test Deck transactions and test accounts may not be considered as a reliable source of pre-validated information. Therefore, they are functionally unavailable until such time that a thorough review and spot check have been performed by the CLEC. Another example is that responses to documentation and process issues have exceeded the predefined one business day duration set forth in the CLEC/Resale Handbook.² Even if such problems are addressed on an ad-hoc basis, KPMG's experience has differed from the documented NJ testing process.

Assessment

CLECs cannot utilize the test environment effectively without accurate and complete documentation of its characteristics and use. The inconsistencies and incorrect information provided in the New Jersey Quality Baseline Validation Test Deck documentation can cause delays in the CLECs' ability to conduct business. Problems experienced in the testing process may represent a barrier to market entry for CLECs that choose to use an EDI interface.

APPENDIX A
Scenario Inconsistencies

Scenario #	Matrix Scenario Description Location	Test Deck Scenario Description Location
1	Page 2-3	Page 3-49
7	Page 2-3	Page 3-76
13	Page 2-4	Page 3-97
17	Page 2-5	Page 3-113
21	Page 2-5	Page 3-133
27	Page 2-6	Page 3-157
34	Page 2-6	Page 3-189

APPENDIX B

Order Scenario Errors

Order Scenario #	Test Deck Scenario Location	Description of Error
2	Page 3-53	1) Bell Atlantic example uses an RS rather than a CRS form, as required in the LSOG 4 Ordering Matrix ³ . 2) The LNUM ⁴ field on the RS form, required to be unique per TN line, is duplicated on the second RS form. 3) USOCs provided are not accurate.
3	Page 3-57	1) Only one TN is provided for the new ISDN line, however ISDN requires an associated, second TN.
28	Page 3-160	1) Scenario 28 details "migrate as specified," however the order is written as "migrate as is," with no changes made to the account.
30	Page 3-169	1) The CSR provided lists only four lines, as opposed to the five described in the scenario.
33	Page 3-183	1) The EDI request example migrates three lines, however the scenario calls for two lines.
35	Page 3-192	1) A CSR is available for <i>new</i> account (732) 897-6193.

APPENDIX C

Pre-Order Scenario Errors

Pre-Order Scenario #	Test Deck Scenario Location	Description of Error
1	Page 3-2	1) Address provided in matrix scenario description does not match address populated in the order.
5	Page 3-14	1) TOS field on the example EDI request is coded as residential; however, the associated CSR lists a business address.
6	Page 3-19	1) TOS field on the example EDI request is coded as residential; however, the associated CSR lists a business address.
7	Page 3-21	1) TOS field on the example EDI request is coded as residential; however, the associated CSR lists a business address.
8	Page 3-23	1) TOS field on the example EDI request is coded as residential; however, the associated CSR lists a business address.
9	Page 3-26	1) TOS field on the example EDI request is coded as residential; however, the associated CSR lists a business address.
12	Page 3-32	1) TOS field on the example EDI request is coded as business; however, the associated CSR lists a residential address and type of service.
13	Page 3-34	1) Field ABVNME within the DLR form ⁵ is not valid for Bell Atlantic South.
14	Page 3-36	1) Value of field QUALTEL offered in scenario matrix ((201)385-4638) does not match the value entered in the EDI request example ((201)387-7701). 2) EDI request example contains the field SVCTYP which is no longer valid in LSOG 4 ⁶ .
15	Page 3-38	1) TOS field in the example CSR request is coded as business; however, the account belongs to a residential customer.
16	Page 3-40	1) TOS field in the example CSR request is coded as business; however, the account belongs to a residential customer.
17	Page 3-43	1) TOS field in the example CSR request is coded as business; however, the account belongs to a residential customer.
18	Page 3-45	1) TOS field in the example CSR request is coded as business; however, the account belongs to a residential customer.

APPENDIX D

Order Scenario-Related Issues

Order Issue #	Description of Issue
1	The LSRNO field of the LSR form ⁷ is grayed out in the Business Rules, indicating that it is not applicable, however the field is included in the test deck sample EDI requests.
2	All of the sample orders utilize a ten day interval for Desired Due Date; however, the actual intervals provided in the Product Interval guides ⁸ specify different numbers of days.
3	A code is required to populate the ISPID field on the RS form ⁹ when the second character of the TOS field on the LSR form equals "H" (ISDN BRI). The source of this code is not provided in the Business Rules.
4	Within LSOG 4, Location Number (LOCNUM) appears as a required field on a number of forms, indicating the service location number for the service requested ¹⁰ . This number is to be provided by the customer; however, it is unclear what the basis is for generating this number.
5	Change Control announcement CR#1299 ¹¹ makes edits to the usage notes for the ALI field on the DL form and states that the ALI is a required field for all Resale and Platform orders. The CTE examples do not show a populated ALI code and are therefore incorrect.

¹ *Bell Atlantic – New Jersey Quality Baseline Validation Test Deck, LSOG 4*, Release Date: February, 2000; Publication Date: February, 2000.

² *CLEC/Resale Handbook, Volume II*, “New Release & New Entrant Testing in the CLEC Test Environment.”

³ *Bell Atlantic Order Business Rules, Version 4.1.1, LSOG 4*, page 1-5, Release Date: February, 2000; Publication Date: December, 1999.

⁴ *Bell Atlantic Order Business Rules, Version 4.1.1, LSOG 4*, page 2-321, Release Date: February, 2000; Publication Date: December, 1999.

⁵ *Bell Atlantic Pre-Order Business Rules, Version 4.1.1, LSOG 4*, page 145, Release Date: February, 2000; Publication Date: December, 2000.

⁶ *Bell Atlantic Pre-Order Business Rules, Version 4.1.1, LSOG 4*, pages 165-174, Release Date: February, 2000; Publication Date: December, 2000.

⁷ *Bell Atlantic Order Business Rules, Version 4.1.1, LSOG 4*, page 2-147, Release Date: February, 2000; Publication Date: December, 1999.

⁸ <http://www.bellatlantic.com/wholesale/html/resources.htm>

⁹ *Bell Atlantic Order Business Rules, Version 4.1.1, LSOG 4*, page 2-327, Release Date: February, 2000; Publication Date: December, 1999.

¹⁰ *Bell Atlantic Order Business Rules, Version 4.1.1, LSOG 4*, page 2-245, Release Date: February, 2000; Publication Date: December, 1999.

¹¹ *Bell Atlantic System Support Help Desk, Type 1 Severity 2 Bulletin*, CR #1299, February 17, 2000.